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Preface

While I was making the last changes to this book in preparation for its publication, yet another Holocaust Remembrance Day – January 27th – passed with its many commemoration events. On that memorable day in 1945, the Red Army overran the infamous Auschwitz Camp. For the Politics of Memory, it is business as usual. Those equipped with finely tuned societal seismographs, however, have noticed that something is afoot.

The most-recent indicator for this was an article written by Jewish activist David Cole, and published in the conservative mainstream periodical Taki’s Magazine (Cole 2016). Cole had been dabbling for a while in Auschwitz research, and had burned his fingers in the process. Yet he had gained some insights which are worth considering. We will encounter him and his work later in the present book. In the just-mentioned article, Cole had the following to say about Auschwitz:

“Ah, Auschwitz. Yes, here’s where we still have a problem. […] there are genuine problems with what is commonly claimed to be part 3 [of the Holocaust]—that in 1943 Auschwitz-Birkenau was ‘renovated’ to become an ultra-super be-all end-all extermination facility. To me, the evidence just isn’t there, and the evidence that does exist calls that claim into question. […] Orthodox historians] backed themselves into a corner by putting Auschwitz, with its phony, postwar tourist-attraction ‘gas chamber’ and its complete lack of documentary evidence supporting a killing program, front and center as the heart of the Holocaust. They’re in so deep at this point that they can’t back off. It’s surprisingly easy to get the leading lights of anti-denial to admit as much one-on-one. Rick Eaton has been the senior researcher at the Simon Wiesenthal Center for thirty years. He’s as major a player in the fight against Holocaust denial as anyone on earth. Two years ago, I corresponded with him (under a pseudonym, of course… he’d never speak directly with the likes of me!) regarding the Auschwitz problem. I explained my thesis to him, that Auschwitz, having various ‘issues’ that call the credibility of extermination claims into question, should not be used to represent the Holocaust. He agreed […].

Keep in mind that even though I was using a pseudonym, I was not
falsely claiming to be anyone of note. In other words, Eaton made that admission to a complete nobody, a total stranger. One gets the feeling that many of these experts are secretly longing for the day when they can be open about the ‘Auschwitz problem’ and move past it […].”

If you want to find out why we have a problem with Auschwitz, the answer is in your hands, because the research forming the basis of the present study is what made Cole and other Jewish intellectuals take a closer, critical look into the orthodox Auschwitz narrative. In fact, in order to get an update on the latest research results, Cole got in touch with me in order to get some input before preparing the above article, among other things.

So, if the historian Eaton from the Simon Wiesenthal Center and Cole can acknowledge that this research has revealed a profound problem with the mainstream Auschwitz narrative, can’t we all do the same?

Of course we can.

But when I started to take a look at that “problem” in the late 1980s, it wasn’t a matter of course at all. A good part of that trail had yet to be blazed, and it wasn’t going to be easy. Let me briefly describe my journey along that path as a primer to what you are going to read in this book.

As a German citizen, I started my journey in that country. In 1985, while I was studying in West Germany’s capital Bonn, the West-German parliament discussed whether the law should be tightened in order to make things more difficult for Holocaust deniers. At that time, I was merely 20 years old and still in the first half of my university studies of chemistry. I did not object to tightening the law against Holocaust deniers. After all, who could argue against outlawing the vile propaganda lies of Nazis, anti-Semites and other extremists? For justice’s sake, however, I thought back then that such laws should be applied equally against the deniers of all genocides.

Roughly a year later and by mere coincidence, I actually met such a denier for the first time, a self-declared right-wing radical. Discussing the topic with him at a bar under the influence of a couple of beers left some bad-tasting memories. His arguments, for instance that it wasn’t six but “only” three million victims, seemed crass at best. Although I agreed with his analysis that the Holocaust is misused to suppress patriotic movements in particular in Germany, his evident political motives made me deem him untrustworthy.

Another three years later, a libertarian friend of mine gave me the book Was ist Wahrheit? (What Is Truth?) by Paul Rassinier. Rassinier, a French socialist, had established his own pacifist resistance group against the German occupiers during the Second World War. In that context, he helped Jews flee to Switzerland. He was caught by the Germans and promptly deported to the Buchenwald Camp. A short while later, he was sent to the underground production facility of the so-called “V-Waffen” (retaliation weapons = missiles) of the Mittelbau Concentration Camp under terrible circumstances. He survived
the war only barely. What would you expect such a person to write about his experiences in the camps?

What I read in this book was the opposite of what I had expected. Rassinier accuses his fellow inmates of exaggerations and lies, and he profoundly challenges the traditional Holocaust narrative. He gives all kinds of reasons for this, and although I considered them comprehensible, they were difficult to verify. His book could not so easily be swept aside as the drivel of a Nazi and anti-Semite, simply because Rassinier was not a Nazi, quite to the contrary. He was not a perpetrator, but rather a victim; not an anti-Semite, but someone who had risked his life to help Jews. This book turned my moral worldview upside down. But because I was not a historian, I neither felt called upon nor competent to do anything about the matter.

A few months after that, in the summer of 1989, I read another book which dealt with the political misuse of Germany’s attempt to come to terms with its past. The author was the Swiss political scientist Dr. Armin Mohler, who had researched and published on this topic since the 1960s. I had read earlier editions of his relevant studies. Yet what I read in this new edition was a little too much to digest: Mohler reports in it that a U.S. expert for execution technologies had recently (1988) written an expert report, in which he claimed to have proved that the purported gas chambers at Auschwitz and Majdanek could neither have functioned nor been used as such. One of his arguments were chemical analyses that showed that no traces of the poison gas used back then – “Zyklon B” – could be detected in the walls of the gas chambers.

Excuse me? How can you look for traces of gas 45 years later and expect to find anything in the first place? GAS! Hello?!? Gas blows away; it’s that simple.

Or maybe it’s not that simple. Back then I was in the process of writing my master’s thesis, hence was about to become an accredited chemist. But I was too stupid to understand why somebody would carry out analyses like that. Therefore, I went to the library of the research center where I was working at that time, and I consulted a chemical encyclopedia. Question: What is “Zyklon B”? Next question: Can this substance cause a chemical reaction which makes it possible to find chemical traces in exposed masonry in the long run? And if so, what kind of reaction? And under what circumstances? And which factors would influence that reaction? And how stable are the products of that reaction? And, and, and…

These questions were all basically chemical in nature, hence within my field of professional expertise. The problems were hair-raising, and the repercussions of any solution to this problem were possibly far-reaching. What should I do? This time I could not talk my way out of it by claiming that I am not a chemist and could therefore not contribute anything.
As a first step, I got myself a copy of the report by that U.S. expert. That in itself was an obstacle course, because it turned out that the German edition of this technical report had been banned in Germany where the constitution expressly says that censorship does not exist. Well, great! I instantly asked myself: “Where the heck do we live?” So, I got myself an English edition instead, which I translated step by step. While so doing, I found factual mistakes and deficiencies galore which, as it turned out later, were only the tip of the iceberg (on this see my footnotes and comments in Leuchter et al. 2017). Something had to be done to iron out those shortcomings and to put that entire matter on a solid foundation. But who would tackle such a hot potato?

If I get involved in that matter, doesn’t that amount to my admitting indirectly that the question “Were there any homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz?” could be answered any differently than with a YES? By taking that question seriously, doesn’t that turn me into a doubter? Doesn’t that make me already half a denier? A justifier of the propaganda of Nazis, anti-Semites, right-wing radicals, and so on? Do I want that?

I was raised in a society which indoctrinates people that they must not doubt the orthodox Holocaust narrative; that doubting it is evil. Hence, I felt guilty only because Rassinier and this U.S. execution expert had aroused doubts in my mind. At the same time, however, I was convinced that this feeling of guilt wasn’t right; that a society which condemns doubt and ostracizes doubters puts itself in the wrong. An enlightened society welcomes doubts and answers them with rational arguments. Only dictatorships suppress doubts and counterarguments, and persecute doubters and dissidents.

I was facing an interesting challenge that evidently went far beyond the chemical issues raised. How far it reached I did not quite fathom initially. This, however, was exactly what made the matter even more enticing. Hence, I accepted the challenge. The result of this you are now holding in your hands (or viewing on your screen) in an updated and greatly expanded edition.

I have described the events leading to the present book more thoroughly elsewhere, to which I refer the interested reader to Rudolf 2016c. Allow me to add a few words here about the history of this study. An early version of the present book had been written on request of a defense lawyer in the style of an expert report. Since late 1991, it was presented as evidence in criminal proceedings against so-called “Holocaust deniers,” and I myself appeared as a chemistry expert witness at various trials. I was never allowed to testify in court about that topic, though. Although German courts of law are not allowed to reject expert witnesses who are already in the courtroom and who can testify expertly on the case’s matters of fact, that did not bother the respective judges at all. They simply violated German procedural rules, and one of these judges even threatened me with prosecution in case I dared testify along the lines of the defense’s motion – before I had uttered even the slightest peep.
All kinds of personalities of public life pulled out all the stops to prevent me from continuing my activities as an expert witness. In the end, the German Federal Supreme Court even changed case law by determining that in Germany no one is anymore allowed under the threat of prosecution to even merely file a motion to introduce evidence which argues along the line of the present book.

The reason for this was explained to me in 1993 by Prof. Dr. Arndt Simon, at that time managing director at the Max Planck Institute for Solid State Research, where I worked on my PhD thesis back then:

“Every era has its taboo. Even we researchers have to observe the taboo of our era. We Germans may not address this topic; others have to do this. We have to accept that we Germans have less rights than the others.”

That can’t be true, can it? Would you accept it, dear reader, if someone said, “Negroes have less rights than the others”? Or “Jews have less rights than the others”? If not, then why are some of you merely shrugging your shoulders when it is directed against Germans?

Hence, I wouldn’t let go. Consequently, my situation grew increasingly precarious. I had even reason to fear that they would lock me up for my research and throw away the keys. Finally, the pressure on me became so unbearable that in 1996 I decided to leave Germany for good, which I succeeded in doing after quite a steeplechase. I have described the details of this post-history of the present book, which is considerably more dramatic than its pre-history, elsewhere as well (Rudolf 2016, 2016c).

In the present edition of this study, I could not include the biographical background of this book, which might be even more interesting to some than my technical and chemical studies. Doing so would have inflated the book to more than 700 pages. That was out of the question also because one version of this edition has been printed throughout in four colors due to the more than one hundred color illustrations. My biographical essays, however, hardly have any illustrations, hence it would have been inefficient in terms of production costs and hence sales price to include them here. I may point out, though, that
both of my autobiographical books can be downloaded from the internet as free PDF files:


With that said, I wish you happy reading!

Germar Rudolf, Red Lion, Pennsylvania, USA, February 5, 2017
1. Prelude

1.1. Slow Death in U.S. Gas Chambers

On June 15, 1994, dramatic events unfolded during the carrying out of a death sentence. David Lawson, sentenced to death for a capital felony, was scheduled to be killed by hydrogen cyanide in the gas chamber located in the state prison of Raleigh, North Carolina – but the prisoner refused to assist his executioners.¹ Lawson repeatedly held his breath for as long as possible and took only short breaths in between.² Lawson exhibited enormous willpower, calling out to both executioners and witnesses throughout his execution:

“I am human.”

At first his cry was clearly audible, but as the minutes went by he became less and less understandable and finally, more than ten minutes into the execution, there was just a mutter. He was declared dead only after eighteen minutes. The witnesses to the execution were horrified. The warden of the prison, who had also supervised the execution, was so shaken that he resigned. Because of this execution fiasco, executions with poison gas have been abandoned for a short period of time in the USA and replaced with lethal injections.

By early March 1999, however, this horror had already been forgotten.

---

1 For a detailed description of this execution see Krueger 1994.
This time, the victim was a German national. Despite intervention by the German government, Walter LaGrand was executed in the state prison at Florence, Arizona. LaGrand’s death struggle against lethal cyanide gas lasted eighteen minutes. Thirty witnesses peered through a bulletproof window as the confessed, convicted murderer died horribly behind a steel-reinforced door.³

It is now clear to the experts, and especially to those still waiting on death row, that a quick and painless execution by gas requires the cooperation of the intended victim. Prisoners about to be gassed were usually encouraged to inhale deeply as soon as the cyanide was released in order to make their deaths come easily. However, if an intended victim was uncooperative, the execution could easily become a fiasco. By simply refusing to take the deep breaths needed to quickly inhale a lethal dose of cyanide, the agony could last for more than eighteen minutes, even under ideal conditions. Publications in the United States reveal that executions lasting from 10 to 14 minutes are the rule, rather than the exception. Amnesty International calls them “botched executions.”⁴⁻⁶

The method used in US-American execution gas chambers was introduced in 1924. The expense to kill just one single person is tremendously high, since neither the witnesses, nor the prison personnel or the environment may be endangered by the poison gas released for such an execution. Reinforced-glass windows, massive, heavy, hermetically-sealed steel doors, powerful ventilation systems with a device to burn the evacuated poisonous gases, and a chemical treatment of the chamber interior to neutralize all remaining traces of the poison make this execution method the most cumbersome of all.⁷

During the last two decades of the 20th century, the only technical expert in the United States specializing in building and maintaining this equipment was Frederick A. Leuchter Jr., sometimes referred to in the media as “Mr. Death,”⁸ since his profession was the design, construction and maintenance of various kinds of execution devices.⁹

³ Freitag 1999; Mannheimer Morgen, March 5, 1999.
⁴ The News & Observer, Raleigh (N.C.), June 11, 1994, p. 14A (according to the prison warden, normally 10-14 min.).
⁵ Duffy 1962, p. 101 (13-15 min.); Duffy was warden of San Quentin Prison for almost 12 years, during which time he conducted the execution of 88 men and 2 women, many of them executed in the local gas chamber.
⁶ Trombley 1992, p. 13 (approximately 10 minutes or more.); Amnesty International, Botched Executions, Fact Sheet December 1996, distributed by Amnesty International USA (more than 7 min). See also more recently Christianson 2010; this last book will be quoted more often in Section 7.1., where I will discuss this issue more thoroughly. On the cruelty of gas-chamber executions see also the interview with the executioner of the US penitentiary at Parchman, Mississippi, Donald Cabana: https://youtu.be/bVpB1ZJKbzY; as well as his memoirs: Cabana 1996.
⁷ Re. the technical proceedings see Leuchter/Faurisson/Rudolf 2017, pp. 195-226.
⁸ Such is the title of a documentary movie directed by Errol Morris about Fred Leuchter, shown at the Sundance Film Festival in Park City (Utah, USA) on January 27, 1999 (see Morris 1999/2001/2003. The original version first shown on Jan. 27, 1999 during the Sun-
Figure 2: View into the execution gas chamber of the State Penitentiary in Florence, Arizona, USA.

dance Film Festivals was reworked after protests.

9 The following paragraphs were adapted from M. Weber 1998.
A feature article in *The Atlantic Monthly* (Feb. 1990), for example, factually described Leuchter as

“the nation’s only commercial supplier of execution equipment. [...] A trained and accomplished engineer, he is versed in all types of execution equipment. He makes lethal-injection machines, gas chambers, and gallows, as well as electrocution systems [...]”

Similarly, a lengthy *New York Times* article (October 13, 1990), complete with a front-page photo of Leuchter, called him “The nation’s leading adviser on capital punishment.”

In his book about “America’s Capital Punishment Industry,” Stephen Trombley confirms that Leuchter is, in fact,

“America’s first and foremost supplier of execution hardware. His products include electric chairs, gas chambers, gallows, and lethal injection machines.
He offers design, construction, installation, staff training and maintenance.”  
(Trombley, p. 8)

Killing someone in a gas chamber is very dangerous for those who carry out the execution, above all because the dead body of the victim is saturated with lethal gas. After the execution, explains Leuchter (ibid., p. 98):

“You go in. The inmate has to be completely washed down with chlorine bleach or with ammonia. The poison exudes right out through his skin. And if you gave the body to an undertaker, you’d kill the undertaker. You’ve got to go in, you’ve got to completely wash the body.”

Bill Armontrout, warden of the Missouri State Penitentiary in Jefferson City, confirms the danger (ibid., p. 102):

“One of the things that cyanide gas does, it goes in the pores of your skin. You hose the body down, see. You have to use rubber gloves, and you hose the body down to decontaminate it before you do anything [else].”

In Leuchter’s opinion, gas-chamber use should be discontinued, not just because of the cruelty of this method of execution, but because of his beliefs relating to gas chambers as such (ibid., p. 13):

“They’re dangerous. They’re dangerous to the people who have to use them, and they’re dangerous for the witnesses. They ought to take all of them and cut them in half with a chain saw and get rid of them.”

With a career built on the motto “Capital punishment, not capital torture,” Leuchter took pride in his work. He was glad to be able to ensure that condemned prisoners die painlessly, that the personnel who carried out executions were not endangered, and that taxpayer dollars were saved.

1.2. Hydrogen Cyanide – a Dangerous Poison

Hydrogen cyanide, is not, of course, utilized solely for the purpose of executions in U.S. gas chambers, but for much more beneficial purposes as well. Since approximately the end of WWI, hydrogen cyanide, or HCN, has been used to exterminate vermin such as bedbugs, lice, corn weevils, termites, cockroaches, and other pests. It is, of course, important to be extremely cautious while applying hydrogen cyanide in order to avoid disaster, because it is in many ways a highly dangerous poison.

The residents of a house in Los Angeles, California, had to learn this in a quite painful way shortly before Christmas 1947. They had hired the Guarantee Fumigation Company to destroy the termites which threatened to eat up the wooden structure. The pest controllers, however, were apparently not very competent, because when using a container of pressurized HCN to fill the house, which had been wrapped up like a Christmas present, they exceeded
safe limits and pumped in too much gas. (Figure 4). Due to unknown reasons, the mixture of air and HCN, which can be highly explosive under certain circumstances, ignited during the fumigation. The resulting explosion destroyed the entire dwelling.

However, hydrogen cyanide has yet another insidious characteristic: it is highly mobile. This mobility is highly welcome when it comes to killing vermin: Wherever fleas and bugs try to hide, the gas will still reach them! Unfortunately, hydrogen cyanide does not restrict itself to attacking vermin. Rather, it indiscriminately seeps into the smallest cracks and even penetrates porous substances such as felt sealing materials and thin walls, thereby leaking into areas where it is not welcome. Failures on the part of disinfestors to ensure that all places to be fumigated are adequately sealed off have been described in toxicological literature (Moeschlin 1986, p. 300):

A gassing requires 1-2% by volume, while an explosion requires 6% by volume or more; see, in this regard, Section 6.3.

“How to get rid of termites,” Life, Dec. 22, 1947, p. 31; a much smaller accident occurred during an attempt to euthanize a cat, whose intense scratching on the execution-chamber walls created a spark that made the poison gas, which evidently had been administered in too high a concentration, explode. The cat escaped. The press did not report the kind of poison gas used, though (“Lethal Gas Chamber…” 1936).
“Example: J.M., a 21-year-old female home decorator, was working in the basement of the house, the second floor of which was being treated for vermin with cyanide gas. Due to insufficient sealing during fumigation, the gas penetrated the corridors, where it poisoned the disinfestor, and reached the cellar through air shafts. Mrs. M. suddenly experienced an intense itching sensation in her throat followed by headache and dizziness. Her two fellow workers noticed the same symptoms and they all left the cellar. After half an hour, Mrs. M. returned to the cellar whereupon she suddenly collapsed and fell unconscious. Mrs. M. was taken to a hospital together with the unconscious exterminator. Mrs. M. recovered and was released. The exterminator, by contrast, was pronounced dead on arrival.”

The dangers of this type of poison gas are not merely restricted to persons in the same house in which fumigation is taking place. Large quantities of gas may penetrate the open air and endanger the entire neighborhood, as shown by an accident in the fall of 1995 in a Croatian holiday resort:12

12 DPA 1995, p. 7. Research has failed to determine which toxic gas was involved. Since hydrogen cyanide is one of the most poisonous and most rapidly diffusing of all gases used in disinestation, the reported damage would have been at least as great if caused by hydrogen...
“That failed profoundly. Three local residents suffering from symptoms of poisoning and a number of surviving woodworms were the results of the botched action against vermin in a church in the Croatian holiday resort of Lovran, close to Rijeka. The exterminator’s clumsy work necessitated the evacuation of several hundred residents of the locality.

The exterminators tried to treat the Church of the Holy Juraj for woodworms during the night, using the highly toxic gas. But since they failed to seal off the church appropriately, the gas seeped into surrounding houses in which people were already asleep. ‘Fortunately, the people woke up immediately because of cyanide, even if hydrogen cyanide was not in fact involved in this accident. A number of additional examples are described by K. Naumann 1941."
sudden attacks of nausea – that’s what saved them from certain death,’ wrote the newspaper Vecernji List. Three residents nevertheless suffered severe intoxication. The mayor decided to evacuate the center of the town. The exterminators were arrested. The woodworms survived. dpa”

But that is still not all: on top of this, hydrogen cyanide is also a persistent poison. It adheres wherever it is utilized, especially in a moist environment. Deadly cyanide gas continues to evaporate slowly from moist objects for hours and days, involving a long-term environmental hazard where sufficient ventilation cannot be assured.

A 1935 case of accidental HCN poisoning in the USA highlights this. A residential home had been fumigated with HCN, and subsequently thoroughly ventilated for 24 hours. However, that wasn’t good enough, because the workmen hired to recondition the premises who entered the house right afterwards “complained of sickness during their work.”

This led to an extended scientific study, in the course of which several standard-size houses were fumigated with HCN and subsequently ventilated for 24 hours. After this, the HCN quantities remaining at various locations in these houses were measured meticulously. Some of these houses were furnished and filled with the usual personal property; others were unfurnished.

One series of gassings occurred during the summer, the other during the winter. The results of these scientific experiments were published four years later and stated among other things (Page/Lubatti/Gloyns, p. 31):

“1. All windows should be kept open for 24 hr. unless this leads to the entry of rain or snow.

2. A ventilation period of 24 hr. is generally sufficient for an empty house of normal construction. A longer period may be required for a furnished house or for a house which (a) is damp, (b) contains an unusual proportion of dead space, (c) contains rooms without windows providing adequate communication with the open air.

(c) Precautions

1. Fumigation of clothing and particularly of bedding in a house, as a regular practice, is definitely undesirable.

2. Upholstered furniture should be placed in such a position as best to facilitate airing. Cushions, etc. should be spread out singly on furniture which is not upholstered. […]

4. If the house contains a considerable quantity of absorbent material or if the fabric is likely to be unusually absorptive, e.g. if partitions of insulating board are employed, or if the construction of the house, or any other circumstances, suggest that a period of 24 hr. airing may not be sufficiently long, all doors and windows should be closed after performing the tests with benzidine acetate–copper acetate, and these tests should be repeated after the house has remained closed for 2 hr. This will allow absorbed gas to be given off and to
build up a concentration in the air space. If this is still not greater than […] 0.0009 % by vol., reoccupation may be permitted.”

Later in the present study, we will encounter moist rooms, chock-full of moist objects and without appropriate means of ventilation, which are said to have been filled with HCN.

The danger of lingering amounts of hydrogen cyanide is also emphasized by an especially dramatic and simultaneously macabre accident in the United States in the fall of 1998 (S. Ball 1998):

Los Angeles Times

Oct. 13, 1998 | STEVE BALL, TIMES STAFF WRITER

9 Hurt after Student’s Apparent Suicide by Cyanide

Toxic fumes produced when a college student from Orange County died of an apparent suicide Monday forced the evacuation of an Iowa dormitory and the hospitalization of nine people, authorities said.

Carl T. Grimm, 20, a sophomore from Placentia, ingested potassium cyanide about 7:30 a.m. in his dormitory room at Grinnell College, a private liberal arts school about 50 miles east of Des Moines, Iowa, Grinnell Fire Chief Jerry Barns said.

Four paramedics who responded to the call at Younkers Hall came in contact with fumes from the poison, as did two college staff members and three other students.

Grimm was taken to Grinnell Regional Medical Center, where he was pronounced dead. […]

The others who became ill on the Iowa campus were treated and released from the hospital. […]

Firefighters sent to the dormitory evacuated the three-story structure until the Des Moines Hazardous Materials Unit arrived to ventilate the building.

Authorities could not say immediately where or how Grimm acquired the potassium cyanide.

Another case, which occurred somewhat differently, nevertheless led to an accident which was no less tragic. Salts of cyanide, which release cyanide gas in the presence of moisture, are used for the separation of gold and silver during the processing of precious metals. In the case in question, a company was engaged in the processing of the cyanide-rich residues of such chemical reactions contained in large tanks, which is not without risk. The employer irresponsibly directed the workers, who were not equipped with gas masks or
protective clothing, to go into the tanks, which were still releasing cyanide gas. The consequences were tragic:

---

Department of Justice National News Release
MONDAY, MAY 10, 1999

On May 7, the jury in Pocatello, ID, found that Allan Elias ordered employees of Evergreen Resources, a fertilizer manufacturing company he owned, to enter and clean out a 25,000-gallon storage tank containing cyanide without taking required precautions to protect his employees. Occupational Safety and Health Administration inspectors repeatedly had warned Elias about the dangers of cyanide and explained the precautions he must take before sending his employees into the tank, such as testing for hazardous materials and giving workers protective gear.

Scott Dominguez, an Evergreen Resources employee, was overcome by hydrogen cyanide gas while cleaning the tank and sustained permanent brain damage as a result of cyanide poisoning. […]

Over a period of two days in August 1996, Elias directed his employees – wearing only jeans and T-shirts – to enter an 11-foot-high, 36-foot-long storage tank and clean out cyanide waste from a mining operation he owned. Elias did not first test the material inside the tank for its toxicity, nor did he determine the amount of toxic gases present. After the first day of working inside the tank, several employees met with Elias and told him that working in the tank was giving them sore throats, which is an early symptom of exposure to hydrogen cyanide gas.

The employees asked Elias to test the air in the tank for toxic gases and bring them protective gear – which is required by OSHA and which was available to the defendant free of charge in this case. Elias did not provide the protective gear, and he ordered the employees to go back into the tank, falsely assuring them that he would get them the equipment they sought. Later that morning, Dominguez collapsed inside the tank. And he could not be rescued for nearly an hour because Elias also had not given employees the required rescue equipment.[13]

Even this example fails to convey the full scope of the insidious nature of cyanide gas, since it does not just kill by means of inhalation; even a gas mask may prove insufficient, especially if a person is sweating heavily. Hydrogen cyanide is dissolved most readily on moist surfaces, and it easily penetrates

---

[13] Occupational Safety & Health Administration, news release, May 10, 1999; Allan Elias was sentenced to 17 years in prison on April 28, 2000, www.justice.gov/archive/opa/pr/2000/April/239enrd.htm; an entire book has been written about the case: Hilldorfer/Dugoni 2004. The cyanide-contaminated sludge in the tank also contained phosphoric acid, resulting in the accelerated release of cyanide gas.
the skin. This was proven by a dramatic accident in 1995 in a cave in the French city of Montérolier ("Un expert…," 1998):

"The death of nine persons on June 21, 1995, in the cave of Montérolier (Seine-Maritime) was said to have been caused by the release of cyanide gas originating from the poison gas used during the First World War, the so-called Vincennite. This was announced Wednesday by former Professor of Physical Chemistry Louis Soulié. [...] At a press conference in Buchy, he said that 'neither the children nor the firemen rushing to the rescue – one of whom wore a gas mask – died of carbon monoxide poisoning.' [...] 'Even six days after their deaths, a cyanide concentration twice as high as the fatal dose was still observed in the victims' blood.'

According to the professor's remarks, the three children lit a fire in the cave and threw a Vincennite bomb found in the cave into the fire. The bomb exploded. The gas caused the deaths of three children, four firemen, the father of one of the children and an amateur spelunker.

According to Prof. Soulié, the deaths of the firemen looking for the children in the cave, including the fireman wearing a gas mask, were due to the fact that hydrogen cyanide dissolves in the sweat and penetrates the body through the skin, where it causes poisoning."

Similar to this was a case in the late 1990s that occurred in the storage space of a Hong Kong company trading in industrial chemicals. Three small flasks containing a dilute solution of hydrogen cyanide had been left out in a room uncovered overnight. The next day, a 19-year old female employee who had been in the room for four hours was found unconscious on the floor. The owner of the company, a physicist, rescued the girl and returned to the room to open windows for ventilation. After having spent some 10 minutes in that room, he also entered into an intensive care unit due to severe dizziness. Both patients were discharged days later from the hospital.

Other victims of hydrogen-cyanide poisoning included the firemen called onto the scene. Four firemen, ranging in ages from 25 to 35, wearing a self-contained breathing apparatus along with the normal structural fire-fighter’s protective outfit, experienced mild symptoms of HCN poisoning after spending from 5 to 30 minutes in the affected room. Their symptoms included flushing, dizziness, headache, throat discomfort, chest tightness, and skin and eye irritation, and gave cause for them to be treated at the hospital. Another 50-year-old fireman wearing no such protective clothing or breathing apparatus, who stood 100 feet outside of the room in a corridor, developed chest discomfort, flushing, headache, and eye and skin itchiness, and had to be decontaminated at the hospital as well.

The authors describing the case concluded (Lam/Lau 2000):

"Rescuers should wear full protective clothing and SCBA [self-contained breathing apparatus] to avoid poisoning themselves during rescue attempts."
Because cyanide is readily absorbed from routes including the skin, mucous membranes, and by inhalation, structural firefighter’s protective clothing is not ideal as the ears are exposed and the hydrogen cyanide gas diffuses through the fabrics. [...] in the animal study, hydrogen cyanide gas was absorbed through skin of dogs and guinea pigs and caused fatal outcomes. It is highly likely that the toxic symptoms in cases three to six [fire fighters inside room] are because of absorption of highly concentrated hydrogen cyanide gas through their intact skin. Therefore, firemen should wear special chemical protective clothing covering all parts of the body before entering the contaminated site. Case number 7 [fire fighters outside room] also alerts us to the extensiveness of cyanide gas’s diffusion.”

Even coroners who autopsy victims of hydrocyanic-acid or cyanide poisoning risk getting poisoned (Padmakumar 2010, p. 80):

“Whatever be the manner of poisoning, in medical settings the persons involved in postmortem examination of cases of death of cyanide poisoning are exposed to significant degree of cyanide remaining in the body cavities and tissues of the deceased. This risk is not only for the persons attending postmortem examination but also for the first respondents like police, rescue persons and also persons extending emergency care both outside and within hospital. Hydrocyanic acid is rapidly absorbed from all mucous surfaces and even from unabraded skin. Hence attending a case of cyanide poisoning involves a hazard of inhalation of cyanide gas from the victim.”

1.3. The Acid That Causes Blue Stains

Great excitement was caused by a strange occurrence in a Protestant church at Wiesenfeld, Upper Franconia, Germany, in the spring and summer of 1977. The congregation had renovated the deteriorating church at great expense during the previous year, but now they faced a disaster. Huge blue stains were found to have formed in all parts of the plastered interior of the church. The experts having renovated the church were now called in for consultation, and found themselves confronted by a riddle which was only solved by a chemical analysis of the stained portions of the walls. The entire interior

Figure 7: In 1972, the Catholic church in Untergriesbach, Bavaria, was fumigated with Zyklon B. Subsequently the entire plaster turned patchy blue (Konrad Lackerbeck; Wikipedia commons).
surface of the church was impregnated by Iron Blue.\textsuperscript{14} No explanation could be found for this in the literature. It nevertheless proved possible to reconstruct the sequence of events.

A few weeks after the replastering of the church with a water-resistant cement mortar, the entire church had been fumigated with Zyklon B (hydrogen cyanide) to exterminate woodworms in the choir stalls. The hydrogen cyanide released by the Zyklon B did not just kill the woodworms: it also reacted chemically with the plaster. The hydrogen cyanide contained in the Zyklon reacted with the iron oxides contained in concentrations of 1-2\% in all plasters, thus forming Iron Blue, a highly stable compound well known for centuries.\textsuperscript{15}

Another case had occurred five years earlier in 1972 in the Catholic church of St. Michael in Untergriesbach, Bavaria. Here, too, the church had been recently refurbished with fresh plaster, which turned blue after the church had been gassed with Zyklon B to combat woodworms, just as it would happen in Wiesenfeld five years later.\textsuperscript{16}

Reports of blue pigmentation of walls resulting from fumigation with hydrogen cyanide for the destruction of vermin in areas with moist, ferrous plaster:

\textsuperscript{14} Iron Blue is the ISO term (ISO 2495) for iron cyanide blue pigments of various composition, which are also known as Berlin Blue, Turnbull’s Blue, Prussian Blue, Vossen Blue\textsuperscript{c}, Milori Blue, Paris Blue, French Blue, China Blue, Bronze Blue, Steel Blue, Ink Blue, among others, and as ferric ferrocyanide.

\textsuperscript{15} G. Zimmermann 1981, relating to the case of building damage occurring in August 1976 in the Protestant church at D-96484 Meeder-Wiesenfeld. I wish to thank Mr. W. Lüftl, Vienna, for discovering this information, as well as Mr. K. Fischer, Hochstadt am Main, who was held liable for damages as responsible architect, and who supplied me with further details. In English, with comments: Helmut Weber, “Wood Preservation through Fumigation with Hydrogen Cyanide: Blue Discoloration of Lime- and Cement-Based Interior Plaster,” in: Rudolf 2019, pp. 565-570.

\textsuperscript{16} \url{www.pfarrei-untergriesbach.de/pfarrbrief11.htm}. 
ter are not unknown in technical literature, as shown by a recent survey.\textsuperscript{17} The prerequisite for this reaction appears to be that the fumigated plaster must be new and must contain high humidity. In other cases, there was also damage to the structure and interior installations, but no blue stains, perhaps because the plaster was old and had already set.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{Figure 9:} Inky blue stains on the plaster of a church fumigated with hydrogen cyanide (black and white only in G. Zimmermann 1981).

\textsuperscript{17}Emmerling 1995. Whether the examples cited in the paper may perhaps refer to the above-mentioned case only in a roundabout way, must remain open for the time being. Carl Hermann Christmann reports the case of a farm building belonging to an 18th century monastery; the farm building was sold to a farmer following deconsecration, and the farmer then used it as a barn. Approximately 20 years ago, an investor converted the beautiful Baroque building into a luxury holiday restaurant. The existing interior plaster was repaired and painted white. After some time, blue stains appeared in the white paint; the stains were identified by a consulting expert as Iron Blue. The expert assumed that the former owner must have fumigated the building with hydrogen cyanide between 1920 and 1940, which then caused the stains 40-50 years later. Personal communication from C.H. Christmann according to his recollection on July 13, 1999; Mr. Christmann was unfortunately unable to relocate the source of the information. I would be extremely grateful for any references to passages in the literature in relation to this or any other similar case.

\textsuperscript{18}In one case, the fumigation of a church freshly painted with iron-free lime paint led to dark stains caused by the polymerization of hydrogen cyanide: Grosser/Roßmann 1974.
2. The Coup

2.1. Fred Leuchter on Auschwitz and Majdanek

On February 3, 1988, Fred Leuchter received an unexpected visitor at his home in Boston, Massachusetts. A professor of French, Greek and Latin, as well as critic of testimonies, texts and documents, from the University of Lyon II – Dr. Robert Faurisson – had an unusual assignment in mind: He wanted to persuade Leuchter, in his capacity as an expert in execution technology, to prepare a professional opinion to be used in a criminal trial then taking place in Toronto, Canada. More precisely, Dr. Faurisson wanted to convince Leuchter to determine whether or not the generally alleged mass exterminations with hydrogen-cyanide gas in the concentration camps of the Third Reich were technically possible. Until that time, Leuchter had never questioned the existence of German homicidal gas chambers. When Prof. Faurisson showed him some mostly technical documents, however, Leuchter began to have doubts about the technical feasibility of the alleged homicidal gasings and agreed to come to Toronto to view additional documentation.

After this meeting and on the assignment of defense counsel, he then traveled to Poland with his wife (who was also his secretary), his draftsman, a video cameraman and a translator, to make a technical examination of the concentration camps at Auschwitz, Auschwitz-Birkenau and Majdanek for the above trial. He returned to the United States and wrote a 192-page report (including appendices). He also brought 32 test samples taken from the masonry in the crematoria at Auschwitz and Birkenau, or rather their ruins. These are the locations where the alleged gasings are said to have taken place. As a control sample, he also took a sample from a Zyklon-B-disinfestation chamber, where only lice had been killed. The background of these samples is as follows:

Almost all the concentration camps of the Third Reich contained facilities for the disinfestation of lice carried by inmate clothing. Various methods were used to accomplish this objective: hot air, hot steam, several different poison gases, and towards the end of the war even microwaves. Delousing was urgently needed in particular because lice carry epidemic typhus, a disease with a history of repeated outbreaks in eastern and central Europe. Epidemic typhus appeared again during WWII, where it claimed hundreds of thousands of vic-

---

19 Re. background and course of the criminal proceedings, viewed from the perspective of the defense see Lenski 1990; a longer compilation of the entire trial: Kulaszka 2019. As far as I know, the plaintiff has not published anything about this case.

20 Parts of this section are based on Faurisson’s description of how the Leuchter Report came to be: Faurisson 1988.

21 According to a private communication by Robert Faurisson, most of Leuchter’s text was actually written by Faurisson himself.
tions, not only in the concentration camps and prisoner-of-war camps, but among soldiers at the front. Since WWI, the most-effective and the most-widely used means for the extermination of lice and other pests, was hydrogen cyanide, marketed under the trade name Zyklon B (see Leipprand 2008).

It has been known for decades that, within buildings in which Zyklon B is known to have been used to delouse inmate clothing, the walls exposed to hydrogen cyanide exhibit massive, blotchy, bluish discoloration. I will discuss these stained walls in more details in Section 6.2. At this point it suffices to state that this blue discoloration is due to Iron Blue, which I mentioned already in Section 1.3. As mentioned there, this blue pigment is formed in a chemical reaction by hydrogen cyanide with certain components of masonry, if the conditions favor it. This substance can still be observed in surviving delousing facilities today, hence is obviously a very stable compound. Which

**Figure 10**: Single door to an execution gas chamber for one single person per gassing procedure using HCN (Mississippi State Penitentiary in Parchman, Miss., USA; built in the 1950s, designed in the 1930s). The execution of a single person with hydrogen cyanide is inevitably far more complicated than the fumigation of clothing. (Leuchter et al. 2017, p. 220)

**Figure 11**: Door in the room of Crematorium I at Auschwitz (Main Camp) which has been presented for decades to museum visitors as a homicidal gas chamber. This unstable, leaking door with a window pane once separated the washroom from the laying-out room. It could never have served as a gas-chamber door. Such discrepancies between what Leuchter expected to find in Auschwitz and what he found induced him to write his expert report.
exact conditions are conducive to the formation of this pigment, and how stable it really is, will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

Professor Faurisson was the first person to point out that this blue discoloration is absent from the supposed homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. Faurisson’s idea was to analyze samples from the masonry in the alleged homicidal gas chambers for traces of poison gas or its compounds (cyanides) and compare them with samples taken from the delousing chambers. Fred Leuchter followed this suggestion when doing his on-site investigations in Auschwitz in 1988.

On April 20 and 21, 1988, Leuchter took the stand as an expert witness in the courtroom in Toronto. He reported on his research and developed his conclusions. The atmosphere in the courtroom was tense. Leuchter’s testimony was straightforward and at the same time sensational: According to Leuchter, there had never been any possibility of mass extermination of human beings by gassing either in Auschwitz, or in Birkenau, or in Majdanek (Leuchter/Faurisson/Rudolf 2017, p. 56):

“It is the best engineering opinion of this author that the alleged gas chambers at the inspected sites could not have then been, or now, be utilized or seriously considered to function as execution gas chambers.”

Shortly before Leuchter, another witness was questioned: Bill Armontrout, warden of the Maximum-Security Prison in Jefferson City, Missouri. It was Armontrout who, at the request of Defense Attorney Barbara Kulaszka, pointed out that no one in the United States understood the operation of gas chambers better than Fred A. Leuchter. Armontrout himself confirmed in court the great difficulties involved in killing people with poison gas, as Robert Faurisson had done before him.

Following Leuchter, Prof. James Roth, director of a chemical laboratory in Ashland, Massachusetts, also took the witness stand to describe the results of his analysis of the 32 masonry samples, the origins of which had been unknown to him: All samples taken from the gas chambers supposedly used for mass human extermination exhibited either no or only negligible traces of
cyanide, while the sample from the delousing chambers taken as a control exhibited enormously high cyanide concentrations.

2.2. First Reactions

Leuchter’s report and subsequent testimony shook the foundations of Holocaust history, the story of the “Nazi gas chambers.” It cannot surprise that his expert report spread quickly among all those who had always harbored a “different” view about the Third Reich and the minorities persecuted by it. But its impact reached beyond that, because for the first time revisionist claims found attention, if not even acceptance, among wider circles of the general populace (see Nolte 1993; R. Czernin 1998).

Alarmed by this development, those opposing any Revision of the orthodox Holocaust narrative began to systematically destroy Leuchter’s reputation and thus his livelihood. Among other things, he was falsely accused of having claimed to be an engineer, which he wasn’t. He was even sued, although the case was settled outside of court with an agreement between Leuchter and the litigating Engineering Board by Leuchter declaring that he will be a law-abiding citizen, as he had been all his life. The settlement included an unpublished declaration by Leuchter, with which he stated that had never claimed to have been a registered, professional engineer, that he will not do it in the future either, and that he will not “recant or change anything he ever did or said.” The mainstream media did not report the fact that these proceedings against Leuchter ended without a whimper.

Attacks against Leuchter as a person may be impressive for many, but they are absolutely irrelevant when it comes to the facts of the matter. After all, whether the claims Leuchter made in his expert report are correct or not does not depend on which academic degree he has. What matters are his factual arguments.

When I first heard about the existence of the Leuchter Report, I was not at all interested in who its author was or in which context he had prepared the report. I wanted to read it and verify its validity. Back then I worked my way through the report sentence by sentence. While doing so, I noticed several obvious technical mistakes which suggested that the author could not possibly have an education as a scientist or a technician. I therefore considered the entire expert report as potentially unreliable. In addition, this work contained only very few sources allowing the reader to verify what Leuchter claims. All in all, I considered this expert report fascinating, if its claims were true, but not convincing. My reaction to it was not, however, to nag about the deficien-

---


cies of the Leuchter Report, but rather to do a better job with the present work. I began the initial literature research for it in the fall of 1990.

In addition, in 2005 I issued the first edition of a critically commented edition of the Leuchter Report which is suffused with correcting and supplementing footnotes to such a degree that the text in the footnotes is almost as long as the original report (Leuchter/Faurisson/Rudolf). The text of the original Leuchter Report was left intact, since by now it has become a historical document itself. Yet I hope that this unchanged text will not mislead the reader to take every one of Leuchter’s words at face value, because when discussing the topic along Leuchter’s line of argument, this would only lead to embarrassments when facing critical and knowledgeable individuals. For details about my critique of Leuchter’s report, I direct the reader’s attention to this critical edition.

Of course, I was not the only one who noticed the deficiencies of the Leuchter Report. I will subsequently list some of the responses which have come to my knowledge, and I will make brief comments about them. A more-thorough discussion of the most-relevant among these responses can be found in Section 8.4 toward the end of this first part of the present book, after I have presented the facts relevant to the matter at hand.

2.3. Attempts at Refutation and Their Assessment

First of all, it is striking that many of the critiques of Leuchter’s expert report appeared in hardly accessible, at times even obscure publications. It is also indicative that Leuchter’s opponents pick every aspect of his work to pieces, whereas his supporters often tend to justify him uncritically and to remain silent about his mistakes. Neither side in this exchange seems to be willing or able to weigh Leuchter’s arguments objectively and critically and to both criticize his work where it is due and to admit to it where it is correct. While it is a heresy in orthodox circles to even refer to Leuchter as a person to be taken seriously, it is according to my experience almost a sacrilege in revisionist circles to criticize him. Both attitudes are profoundly wrong.

A fact-oriented discussion of the technical arguments on the Holocaust brought to the public by the Leuchter Report was started in France by an attempt at refutation by the French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac in the periodical Jour Juif.24 However, Pressac’s article could hardly qualify as an expert discussion, because he did not back up any of his technical

or scientific claims with evidence or specific scientific argumentation. Though he did point out several deficiencies in the *Leuchter Report*, he made several errors himself in chemical and engineering questions due to his own lack of expertise.\(^{25}\)

Next came the late Dr. Georges Wellers, who was both Professor for Physiology and Biochemistry at France’s National Center for Scientific Research (*Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, CNRS*) and president of the historical commission of the Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation (*Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, CDJC*) in Paris. He wrote an article narrowly focusing on only a few aspects of the *Leuchter Report* (Wellers 1989; German 1991). His paper is characterized by wishful thinking running contrary to physical reality and ignoring what witnesses claimed about the alleged homicidal gassings.\(^{26}\)

The first response from Germany came in 1989 from Germany’s official Institute for Contemporary History (*Institut für Zeitgeschichte*).\(^{27}\) It was based on Pressac’s work, did not bother to back up any of its claims with evidence, and was therefore hardly useful, also due to the all-too-apparent lack of technical expertise of its author, historian Hellmuth Auerbach.\(^{28}\)

A little later, in 1990, a contribution on the *Leuchter Report* appeared in an anthology on the Third Reich, authored by a 90-year-old German retired social worker Werner Wegner, who had qualifications neither in chemistry nor civil engineering, nor did he back up his technical claims (Wegner 1990). Instead of seeking the advice of qualified people on these matters, he drew his own conclusions – to his own massive embarrassment.\(^{29}\) On my question why German historian Dr. Rainer Zitelmann, the responsible editor of this anthology, included this ridiculous piece in his otherwise well-researched compilation, he indicated in a personal letter to me that he had to include the paper to avoid opposition to his book due to the fact that the other papers were ‘revisionist’ in tone.

At the end of 1991, Austrian chemist Dr. Josef Bailer critiqued the *Leuchter Report* in a contribution to a booklet published in Austria (1991, pp. 47-52). This work is notable for largely ignoring the witness testimony on the

---

\(^{25}\) On this cf. Grubach 1992; see also in German: Schuster 1991.


\(^{27}\) H. Auerbach, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, letter to Bundesprüfstelle, Munich, Oct. 10, 1989; Auerbach, November 1989 (no day given), both published in Walendy 1990, pp. 32 and 34; somewhat shortened in Benz 1995, pp. 147-149.

\(^{28}\) In this regard, see my technical appraisal, first reprinted in Amtohn/Roques 1995, pp. 431-435; updated as “Institut für Zeitlegenden” in Rudolf 2016a, pp. 15-27.

procedures supposedly used during the gassings at Auschwitz and for the author’s surprising ignorance of the chemical process involved. Despite criticism directed at his study, Bailer repeated his unsustainable objections in a later publication without responding to his critics. I will address Bailer’s critique more thoroughly in Subsection 8.4.1.

Roughly around the same time, the Auschwitz State Museum, motivated by chemical investigations conducted by Leuchter, ordered an expert report to be compiled. The Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Research, Toxicology Division of Krakow, Poland, named after the late judge Jan Sehn, prepared a pilot study, which was confined to the analysis of masonry samples, on September 24, 1990, under the late Dr. Jan Markiewicz, professor for technical testing (Markiewicz et al. 1991). The report concluded that the reason why Leuchter’s samples from the homicidal gas chambers were mostly negative with respect to traces of cyanide was because the cyanide compounds had been exposed for more than 40 years to weathering, which these compounds were allegedly unable to withstand. Three of these authors from the Jan Sehn Institute later published additional findings (Markiewicz et al. 1994). Both studies, however, were based on a verifiably incorrect analytical method, so that their results were false. Correspondence with the authors failed to elucidate the reasons for the deliberate use of an incorrect method. I will return to this probably most important reaction to the Leuchter Report in Subsection 8.4.2.

In 1997, two reactions worth mentioning resulted from the distribution of a French translation of the first edition of the present work in France. Of them, only one addressed factual claims of my study (Clair 1997), without, however, addressing the scientific issues involved in a valid manner (Rudolf 1997a). The Chemistry Section of the French Academy of Sciences was only able to muster a declaration full of political polemics and personal vituperations without addressing any factual issues (La Vieille Taupe/Guillaume 1997).

30 Gauss 1993a; 1993b, pp. 290-293.
34 Ibid., pp. 59-67.
The first critique of the Leuchter Report that deserved to be called at least partially scientific was published on the Internet in 1998 by an American Ph.D. chemist, Dr. Richard J. Green. Green also criticized the first German-language edition of the present study, unfortunately engaging in massive political name-calling as well (Green 1998a&b). In the ensuing exchange Green avoided any discussion of the central issues. This reaction from the U.S. will be analyzed more closely in Subsection 8.4.4.

In 1999, the Dutch cultural historian Dr. Robert Jan van Pelt, professor of the history of architecture in Canada, produced an expert report on Auschwitz for the defense in the libel case of British Historian David Irving against U.S. author Deborah Lipstadt (van Pelt 1999; cf. Rudolf 2000a&b). It appeared in a revised and expanded version as a book in 2002 (van Pelt 2002). This is the first book in the English language which discusses various revisionist arguments, although it fails to mention even one of the many books and papers written by Carlo Mattogno, the most prolific and knowledgeable revisionist researcher. Van Pelt rests his case mainly on Pres-sac’s works (primarily the one of 1989), although he hardly ever mentions him. He deals with chemical and toxicological issues only in passing, referring to the papers by R. Green. Since the works by van Pelt don’t bring up new arguments of interest in the present context, I will not discuss them here in more detail. Anyone interested in a thorough critique ought to read Mattogno’s The Real Case for Auschwitz (2019).

The last contribution critical about the Leuchter Report and also about my present work which is known to me and was published prior to the present book going to press was authored by the biochemist Dr. Achim Trunk (Trunk 2011). On the little more than two pages, however, where he addresses the topic, he merely repeats briefly some of the arguments proffered by Josef Bailer and Richard Green, which is why I won’t address Trunk in the present study.  

---

35 For a detailed essay on the deficiencies of these contributions see Rudolf 1998, 1999a.
36 Green/McCarthy 1999. About a third of the article consists of political accusations and vilification. For a response, see Rudolf 1999b; Green’s reaction to this (Green 2000), was again filled with political polemics and evasions of the core issues; see my rebuttal: Rudolf 2003c; see also G. Rudolf, “Green Sees Red,” in: Rudolf/Mattogno 2016, pp. 71-88.
37 Trunk’s contribution was discussed in Mattogno 2016c, pp. 24-37; as well as Rudolf 2016a, pp. 373-381.
Most of the above-mentioned attempted refutations of the *Leuchter Report* and subsequent discussion with other revisionists are marred by personal insinuations about the motivations of persons making use of revisionist arguments, or by polemical digressions, neither of which is conducive to the scientific discussion. The reason for this irrational behavior is that the topic addressed here is emotionally highly charged and fraught with ideologies. Only if one can control one’s emotions and can exclude political prejudices and wishful thinking, however, will it be possible to get closer to the truth.
3. No Politics

The question of whether or not systematic mass killings of Jews in homicidal gas chambers specifically constructed for the purpose of accomplishing their extermination took place under the National Socialist regime is apparently still viewed as a political issue, as might have been at least understandable during the war during which it arose. Whether or not a moral appraisal of the National Socialist regime depends on the existence or non-existence of gas chambers is disputable. A political evaluation of the Third Reich may significantly depend upon this moral evaluation. Since the present discussion contains neither a moral nor political evaluation of a long-defunct regime, I shall make no moral or political statements. Personally, I am inclined to judge a politician or political system of the past on the basis of what s/he, or it, was able to leave behind for their respective nation – everything else follows from this. That must suffice at this point.

Revisionists are repeatedly accused of wanting to whitewash National Socialism, redeem it, or even resurrect nationalistic-authoritarian political systems, or assist in a breakthrough of nationalism. That may be true for some revisionists, but certainly not for all of them. But be that as it may, the fact is that political suspicions do not contribute anything to the factual debate, as they cannot refute factual arguments. When it comes to discussing facts, it is therefore irrelevant both what the revisionists want and what others accuse them of wanting.

While researching, our highest goal must at all times be to discover how historical events actually occurred – as the 19th-Century German historian Leopold Ranke maintained. For example, historians should not place research in the service of making criminal accusations against Genghis Khan and the Mongol hordes, nor to whitewash any of their wrong-doings. Anybody insisting that research be barred from exonerating Genghis Khan of criminal accusations would be the object of ridicule and would be subject to the suspicion that he was, in fact, acting out of political motives. If this were not so, why would anyone insist that our historical view of Genghis Khan forever be defined solely by Khan’s victims and enemies?

The same reasoning applies to Hitler and the Third Reich. Both revisionists and their adversaries are entitled to their political views. The accusation, however, that revisionists are only interested in exonerating National Socialism and that such an effort is reprehensible or even criminal, is a boomerang: This accusation implies that it is deemed unacceptable to partially exonerate National Socialism historically, and by so doing, always also morally. But by declaring any hypothetical exoneration based on possible facts as unacceptable, one admits openly not to be interested in the quest for the truth, but in
incriminating National Socialism historically and morally under any circum-
stances and at all costs. And the motivation behind this can only be political. 
Hence, those accusing revisionists of misusing their research for political ends 
have themselves been proven guilty of exactly this offense. It is therefore not 
necessarily the revisionists who are guided by political motives – though quite 
a few of them certainly are – but with absolute certainty all those who accuse 
the revisionists of harboring reprehensible motives. Although many consider 
the anti-fascist motives of those combatting revisionism as morally worth-
while, they remain political motives that are hostile to discovering and evalu-
ating the factual issues at hand.

In short, our research must never be concerned with the possible “moral” 
spin-off effects of our findings in relation to politicians or regimes of the past 
or present, but solely with the facts. Anyone who argues otherwise is the ene-
my of knowledge.
4. A Brief History of Forensic Examinations of Auschwitz

4.1. Introduction

On June 7, 1993, the Max Planck Institute for Solid State Research in Stuttgart issued an internal memorandum informing its employees that a doctoral candidate there – the author of this book – had been dismissed because of private research he had done on Auschwitz. The institute explained in its memorandum, among other things:

“In light of the terrible genocide committed by the rulers of the Third Reich, we consider current investigations about the exact procedure of the murders just as reprehensible as speculations about the number of those murdered.”

Hence one of the world’s leading scientific research institutes stated to its personnel that it is not only unethical, but reprehensible and a cause for dismissal, should they dare to determine exact numbers and procedures. This is not without irony, since it is coming from an institute whose only right to exist is its scientists’ determining exact numbers and procedures.

This does not change the fact, however, that many people are deeply moved by the question whether or not the monstrous crime alleged should be the subject to careful scrutiny by means of thorough forensic analysis. The following is an attempt to answer this question by offering a brief overview on forensic examinations of the purported crime scenes at Auschwitz which have been conducted thus far.

4.2. The Moral Obligation of Forensic Examination

Does it really matter how many Jews lost their lives in the German sphere of influence during the Second World War? Is it so important, after so many years, to attempt painstakingly to investigate just how they died? After all, it is surely morally correct that even one victim is too many; and nobody seriously denies that many individuals fell victim to National Socialism.

To affirm these things, however, is not to raise a valid objection – moral or otherwise – to the scientific investigation of a crime held to be unique and unparalleled in the history of mankind. Even a crime that is alleged to be uniquely reprehensible must be open to a procedure that is standard for any other crime: namely, that it can be – must be – subjected to a detailed material investigation. I will go even one step further: whoever wants to postulate that a crime is unique must be prepared for a uniquely thorough investigation of the alleged crime before its uniqueness is accepted as fact.
If, on the other hand, someone sought to shield so allegedly unparalleled a crime from investigation by erecting a taboo of moral outrage, the creators of that taboo would, at least morally, themselves commit a singular offense: imputing unparalleled guilt, beyond any critique and defense. For if the principle behind this were elevated to a general one, this would mean that everyone who is accused of an extreme, unique crime loses all rights to any defense. That would be the end of all rule of law.

To demonstrate just what kind of double standard is being applied to “the Holocaust” (generally defined as the purposeful annihilation, chiefly by gassing, of millions of Jews by the National Socialists), let us note the international reaction to several recent examples of mass murder or “crimes against humanity.”

In 1949, a trial started in southwest France which caused as much attention in France as did the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial: Mme. Marie Besnard was accused of having murdered twelve people with arsenic. During this extraordinary court battle, 15 experts on medical, chemical, geological and analytical forensic made exhaustive analyses and time-consuming, extensive experiments with the aim of verifying whether the arsenic traces found in the buried victims stemmed from poison or were the result of as-yet-unknown concentration processes in buried corpses. Finally, after twelve years of research and argument of the fifteen experts, of whom eight were professors and one even a Nobel Prize laureate, Mme. Besnard was acquitted due to lack of evidence (Kelleher/Kelleher 1998; cf. Müller 2000).

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, numerous mass graves, containing altogether hundreds of thousands of bodies of victims of the Soviets, were discovered, excavated, and investigated. Not only was the number of victims determined, but in many cases the specific cause of death as well. In the same regions where many of these mass graves were found, some one million Jews are said to have been shot by the Einsatzgruppen during World War II. Yet no such grave has ever been reported found, let alone dug and investigated, in the more than half a century during which these areas have been controlled by the USSR and its successor states.38

During the conflict in Kosovo in 1998-1999, rumors about mass killings by Serbs spread around the world, with claims of thousands of victims in huge mass graves. After the fighting was over, an international forensic commission arrived in Kosovo, searching, excavating and forensically investigating mass graves. These graves proved to be not only fewer than the Serbs’ Albanian opponents had alleged, but to contain only small fractions of the number of victims claimed.39 But be that as it may, fact is that those crimes were extensively investigated.

---

38 This has changed only insignificantly in the 21st century; see Desbois 2010; and in response to earlier papers by Desbois: Mattogno 2015b.
39 See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_crimes_in_the_Kosovo_War.
Did the Allies attempt, during the Second World War and in the years immediately following, to find and to investigate mass graves of persons said to have been victims of the Germans? So far as is known, they made such attempts public only once: at Katyn. But the findings of the Soviet forensic commission, which blamed the mass murder of several thousand Polish officers buried there on the Germans, are today generally considered a fabrication. The report of the international forensic commission invited by the Germans in 1943, on the other hand, which found that the Soviets had carried out this mass murder, is today considered accurate even by the Russia’s government (Sanford 2005).

Why weren’t similar investigations launched during the various postwar tribunals dealing with events that are said to have unfolded at Auschwitz and elsewhere? Why has no defense lawyer ever demanded during those and similar proceedings what is common for any other murder trial, namely the submission of expert reports on the claimed murder weapon and the victims’ cause of death? Why did the world have to wait until 1988 to see such an expert report for the first time, no matter how flawed it may be? Well, the truth is that some forensic research was indeed done right after the war, but the results were not widely publicized. I’ll cover that in Section 4.4.

4.3. A Definition of Forensic Science

Forensic science is generally regarded as a supporting science of criminology. Its aim is to collect and to identify physical remnants of a crime, and from these to draw conclusions about the victim(s), the perpetrator(s), the weapon(s), time and location of the crime as well as how it was committed, if at all. This science is relatively new and entered the courtrooms only in 1902, when fingerprint evidence was accepted, in an English court, for the first time. The 1998 CD-ROM Encyclopedia Britannica writes about forensic science:

“A broad range of scientific techniques is available to law enforcement agencies attempting to identify suspects or to establish beyond doubt the connection between a suspect and the crime in question. Examples include the analysis of bloodstains and traces of other body fluids (such as semen or spittle) that may indicate some of the characteristics of the offender. Fibers can be analyzed by microscopy or chemical analysis to show, for instance, that fibers found on the victim or at the scene of the crime are similar to those in the clothing of the suspect. Hair samples, and particularly skin cells attached to hair roots, can be compared chemically and genetically to those of the suspect. Many inorganic substances, such as glass, paper, and paint, can yield considerable information under microscopic or chemical analysis. Examination of a docu-

40 Where “public” is the key. On the unsuccessful and unpublished search for mass graves in the former German alleged extermination camp Treblinka see for instance Mattogno/Graf 2016, pp. 77-90; Neumaier/Rudolf 2018, pp. 504-506.
ment in question may reveal it to be a forgery, on the evidence that the paper on which it is written was manufactured by a technique not available at the time to which it allegedly dates. The refractive index of even small particles of glass may be measured to show that a given item or fragment of glass was part of a particular batch manufactured at a particular time and place.”

Hence, forensic research is exactly what revisionists, starting with Robert Faurisson, have called the search for material evidence. The revisionists’ demand for such material evidence is entirely consistent with the normal practice of modern law enforcement. Also, as is generally acknowledged, forensic evidence is more conclusive than witness testimony or documentary evidence.

Even though forensic methods have hardly been applied with regard to Auschwitz, and certain conclusions of it may be illegal to publicize in several countries, there are a few examples which I shall discuss briefly in the following chapter.

4.4. Forensic Science and Auschwitz

4.4.1. Forensics in the Courts

4.4.1.1. The Polish Auschwitz Trials of 1946/1947

Politically influenced criminal proceedings conducted in the Stalinist Eastern Bloc have always been problematic. In particular, the trials against alleged German war criminals usually had the character of show trials (cf. for instance Bourtman 2008). Even the forensic “evidence” presented during those trials was often unsound, irrelevant or fabricated. For this it suffices to remind the reader of the Soviet mass murder at Katyn and elsewhere. The Soviet autopsy results were outright forgeries and lies designed to blame this crime on the Germans. Although Poles were victims of this crime, the result of this judicial farce was nevertheless accepted by the communist regime in Poland without scrutiny.

The Polish trials against German defendants accused of deeds allegedly committed during the German occupation are no exception from this Stalinist judicial travesty of the postwar period. They not only had the character of Stalinist show trials, but were also fraught with strong Polish nationalism, which during that period in time was genocidally anti-German in nature.

Considering this background, forensic testimony originating from Stalinist-communist sources ought to be viewed with a healthy amount of skepticism. With that said, let us now turn to such forensic testimony.

Between May 10, 1945 and September 26, 1946, the Polish investigating judge Jan Sehn and the Polish engineer Dr. Roman Dawidowski worked together to forensically investigate the crimes claimed to have been committed at Auschwitz. The result was a lengthy report which listed and explained ma-
terial and documentary evidence in support of the mass murder claim. This report contains most of the evidence which the French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac listed decades later in his 1989 book as “criminal traces” in support of mass-murder claims for Auschwitz. We will encounter and discuss a number of these “criminal traces” in the course of the present study. An exhaustive analysis of all of these traces, however, has already been published by Mattegno (2019), to whom the interested reader’s attention is directed.

In the present context, I would like to focus on chemical research initiated by Jan Sehn. On June 4, 1945, Jan Sehn and the Polish prosecutor Edward Pachalski sent several objects found at the Auschwitz Camp to Dr. Jan Z. Robel of the Institute for Forensic Research (Instytut Ekspertyz Sądowych) in Krakow, requesting that they be tested for cyanide residues. Dr. Robel did as he was asked and submitted his results with a report dated December 15, 1945, which was submitted in evidence in the 1946 Polish trial against Rudolf Höss, one of the former Auschwitz camp commandants.

The Krakow forensic investigator received from Jan Sehn a large bag of hair, presumably cut from the heads of Auschwitz inmates, which also contained other objects (hair clips, hair needles, and a temple stem of some eyeglasses). Tested for cyanide residues, both hair and clips showed positive results. Mortar removed from the side wall of Morgue No. 1 (the alleged homicidal gas chamber) of Crematorium II at Birkenau was also submitted, but Dr. Robel did not mention this sample in his report at all. Finally, zinc-plated ventilation covers allegedly found in the ruins of that same room were tested for cyanide and found to have a positive result as well.

The tests conducted by the institute were mere qualitative, not quantitative, analyses. In other words, they could only determine whether cyanide was present, but not how much of it was there. As to whether or not homicidal gassing with hydrogen cyanide took place in Auschwitz, these analyses are worthless, for the following reasons:

1. There is no way of determining the origin and history of the hair and other objects contained in the bags in Auschwitz. Assuming that the analytic results are correct, from a chemical point of view the following can be noted: A positive test for cyanide in human hair proves only that the hair has been exposed to HCN (hydrogen cyanide). But that result does not suffice to establish that the persons from whom the hair came were killed.

41 Files of the Höss Trial, APMO, Vol. 11, pp. 1-57.
42 Appendix No. 12 of Vol. 11a of the trial files; the text of both the requesting letter and Dr. Robel’s results were published in German in Dokumentationszentrum… 1991, pp. 38-40; Bailer-Galanda et al. 1995, pp. 82-86.
by cyanide. It is a good deal more likely that the hair had already been cut when it was exposed to the gas: in German as well as in Allied camps, it was standard to cut off prisoners’ hair for hygienic reasons. If hair over a certain length was later reused – a German wartime document indicates that this was common practice\(^{43}\) – it had to be deloused beforehand (often with Zyklon B, the active ingredient of which is hydrogen cyanide). Hence, positive cyanide results from loose hair or objects found in it do not prove human gassings.

2. We face a similar problem with the zinc-plated covers: their exact origin and history is unknown. In addition, Robel wrote that his tests resulted in a “light, greenish-blue discoloration” of the test solution caused by Iron Blue. Noticeable cyanide traces, however, would have led to an intensely blue discoloration, large amounts even to a dark discoloration with subsequent precipitation of the pigment. It can therefore be concluded that he found only small traces, if even that.

3. It would have been much preferable for the Krakow Institute to have analyzed wall samples of the alleged gas chambers – or to have mentioned the results of their analysis of the one wall sample that was actually submitted – rather than to have focused on the zinc-plated ventilation covers, for the following reasons:
   a. Whereas the origin and history of these metal covers are uncertain, the origin and (at least partly) the history of the walls of the morgues allegedly used as homicidal gas chambers are known.
   b. In contrast to cement and concrete, zinc-plated metal covers prevent the formation of stable iron-cyanide compounds.\(^{44}\) The developing zinc-cyanide compounds are relatively unstable and must be expected to vanish in a short period of time.\(^{45}\) In all likelihood, this renders Robel’s test irreproducible today.
   c. The tendency of porous wall material in moist underground rooms to accumulate and to bind hydrogen cyanide, physically as well as chemically, is hundreds of times higher than that of sheet metal (see Section 6.7). In addition, the pigment forming in wall material is extremely long-term stable, hence such tests are reproducible even today (see Section 6.6).

\(^{43}\) Letter from the SS-Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungshauptamt, Oranienburg, to concentration camp commanders, August 6, 1942, USSR-511, IMT Vol. 39, pp. 552f. The letter ordered the recycling of prisoners’ hair twenty centimeters or more in length; but see also the critical remarks by Carlos W. Porter, [www.cwporter.com/gussr511.htm](http://www.cwporter.com/gussr511.htm).

\(^{44}\) Zinc prevents the formation of rust, which is required to form long-term-stable iron cyanides.

\(^{45}\) Like earth alkaline cyanides, zinc cyanides are slowly decomposed by humidity.
d. If the reason for Dr. Robel’s not mentioning the mortar sample is the fact that he found no noticeable cyanide traces in them, then this sheds a bad light on his honesty and thus on his entire report.

4. One important aspect of analytical forensics is that its results need to be reproducible. As mentioned before, this is not the case for the metal covers already for chemical reasons, even if they still exist, can be identified and their history ascertained.

4.4.1.2. The 1963-1966 Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial

Several expert reports were prepared during the so-called first Frankfurt Auschwitz trial, the best known being those of the Munich Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Institute for Contemporary History; Buchheim et al. 1964). However, none of these reports was forensic in nature. They addressed legal, historical, or psychological topics. Throughout this mammoth trial, the court, the prosecution and the defense never suggested that material traces of the alleged crime be secured and investigated. The prosecution had at its disposal numerous statements by witnesses and confessions by perpetrators, and it considered this material entirely sufficient to establish beyond reasonable doubt the existence of a program to exterminate Jews at Auschwitz and elsewhere during the Third Reich. The abundance of such evidence has since been used to argue that the lack of documentary and material evidence is irrelevant. That no material evidence was presented during the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial was freely conceded by the court in its ruling:

“The court lacked almost all possibilities of discovery available in a normal murder trial to create a true picture of the actual event at the time of the murder. It lacked the bodies of the victims, autopsy records, expert reports on the cause of death and the time of death; it lacked any trace of the murderers, murder weapons, etc. An examination of the witness testimony was only possible in rare cases. Where the slightest doubt existed or the possibility of a confusion could not be excluded with certainty, the court did not evaluate the testimony of witnesses […]”

46 Throughout his writings, Adalbert Rückerl, one of the most prominent German prosecutors in “Holocaust cases,” dispenses with any mention of material evidence. Instead, he declares documentary evidence the best and most important form of evidence, even in the absence of material evidence for the authenticity and correctness of the documents themselves (in Weber/Steinbach 1984, p. 77). Rückerl reports that it is practically impossible to find a suspect guilty solely on documentary evidence, so that, especially given the increasing time span separating alleged crimes from trial, it is almost always necessary to fall back on witness testimony, even though its unreliability is clear, particularly in trials of so-called “National Socialist violent crimes” (Rückerl 1984, p. 249; 1978, p. 34; Rückerl 1972, pp. 27, 29, 31).

47 Such total naiveté, combined with legal incompetence, on behalf of the defense is best exemplified in Laternser 1966.

48 One of the most prominent German advocates of this thesis was Professor Ernst Nolte (1993, pp. 290, 293, 297).

4.4.1.3. The 1972 Vienna Auschwitz Trial

Between January 18 and March 10, 1972, two architects responsible for the design and construction of the crematoria in Auschwitz-Birkenau, Walter Dejaco and Fritz Ertl, were put on trial in Vienna, Austria.\textsuperscript{50} During the trial, an expert report by the Austrian accredited engineer Gerhard Dubin on the possible interpretation of the blueprints of the alleged gas chambers of the Auschwitz and Birkenau crematoria was presented to the court at the court’s own initiative. The report concluded that the rooms in question could not have been gas chambers, nor could they have been converted into gas chambers.\textsuperscript{51} Thanks to this first methodically sound expert report on Auschwitz, the defendants were acquitted.

4.4.2. Forensics outside the Courts
4.4.2.1. In Search of Mass Graves

In 1965 the Auschwitz State Museum commissioned the Polish company Hydrokop to drill the soil of the former Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp and to analyze the samples. It is not known whether this research was done in the context of the first Frankfurt Auschwitz trial, the main hearings of which had been concluded with the announcement of the verdict in August of 1965. The results of these soil probings, however, vanished into the museum’s archives. They have never been released, which by itself is revealing enough. Years later, however, several pages from this report were photocopied and sent to the German revisionist publisher Udo Walendy, who published them with commentary in an issue of his periodical (Walendy 1993, pp. 7-10). Traces of bones and hair allegedly found at several places might indicate mass graves. The few pages published by Walendy, however, do not reveal whether these findings led to an excavation or a subsequent forensic study of the traces. It is not even evident whether the bone and hair samples collected were human or animal remains. (Since Birkenau had a butcher shop to provide the camp with meat, animal offal might have been disposed of in garbage trenches in the camp’s vicinity.\textsuperscript{52}) In 1994, Franciszek Piper of the Auschwitz Museum confirmed those drillings, hiding it in a footnote.\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} District Court Vienna (ref. 20 Vr 3806/64), Jan. 18 to March 10, 1972; cf. Loitfellner 2002, pp. 163-168; 2006, pp. 183-197.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Personal communications by Walter Lüftl, who interviewed Gerhard Dubin. See Lüftl 2004.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Gutman/Berenbaum 1994, p. 179, note 39; according to this, 42 of 303 samples “contained traces of human ashes, bones, and hair.” This investigation still awaits analysis.
\end{itemize}
4.4.2.2. Leuchter and the Consequences

As a result of the Leuchter report, forensic research on Auschwitz increased after 1988. Each time a researcher came to a conclusion contradicting the widely held views, he was socially ostracized and persecuted, like Prof. Faurisson, Fred Leuchter and the author of the present study, but when the results confirmed the reigning paradigms, the researchers were darlings of the media and politicians, like Jean-Claude Pressac, the researchers from the Jan Sehn Institute in Krakow (Markiewicz et al. 1994), and more recently Prof. Robert van Pelt (2002).

It must therefore be stated that forensic research on Auschwitz is not at all reprehensible, quite contrary to what the Max Planck Institute in Stuttgart wrote about this. Such research has always been done, more or less intensively. What is often considered to be reprehensible, however, is a research result that is unwanted by the authorities. This is an unfortunate bias, because science can prosper only where any result is openly and freely published and discussed without researchers fearing punitive measures.

The present book is an attempt to give the reader an update about the results of the ongoing forensic research on the two major camps of Auschwitz, the Stammlager or Main Camp close to the town of Auschwitz itself, and the Birkenau Camp some 3 km to the northwest of the town. May it not lead to more persecution and ostracism of its author than he already has experienced.54

4.4.2.3. Autopsies

In a normal murder case, the forensic investigation of a victim’s body is extraordinarily important. Unfortunately, after the occupation of Auschwitz by the Red Army on January 27, 1945, no investigation of corpses seems to have been carried out with regard to the question of whether they died due to the effects of poison gas. In fact, such an examination could not really be expected, because the bodies of all gassing victims are said to have been cremated in one way or another. Of course, the lack of evidence does not support the charge, but rather contradicts it.

54 For this, see Rudolf 2016, 2016c.